1 Tammy Hussin, Esq. (Bar No. 155290) 6408 Merlin Drive Carlsbad, CA 92011 3 Telephone (855) 301-2100 ext. 5514 thussin@lemberglaw.com 4 Lemberg & Associates, LLC 1100 Summer Street Stamford, CT 06905 7 Telephone: (203) 653-2250 Facsimile: (203) 653-3424 8 9 Attorneys for Plaintiff, Annette Haenel-Clemmons 10 11 12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 13 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 14 15 '13CV2029 MMABLM Annette Haenel-Clemmons, Case No.: **16** Plaintiff, **COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES** 17 1. VIOLATION OF FAIR DEBT 18 **COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT,** VS. 15 U.S.C. § 1692 ET. SEQ; 19 2. VIOLATION OF FAIR DEBT ARS National Services, Inc.; and DOES 1-**20** 10, inclusive, **COLLECTION PRATICES ACT,** CAL.CIV.CODE § 1788 ET. SEQ. 21 Defendants. 22 JURY TRIAL DEMANDED 23 24 25 **26** 27 28

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Annette Haenel-Clemmons, by undersigned counsel, states as follows:

JURISDICTION

- 1. This action arises out of Defendants' repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, *et seq.* ("FDCPA"), and the invasions of Plaintiff's personal privacy by the Defendants and its agents in their illegal efforts to collect a consumer debt.
 - 2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- 3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that Defendants transact business here and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred here.

PARTIES

- 4. The Plaintiff, Annette Haenel-Clemmons (hereafter "Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in Windsor, Virginia, and is a "consumer" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
- 5. The Defendant, ARS National Services, Inc. (hereafter "ARS"), is a company with an address of 960 South Andreasen Drive, Suite B, Escondido, California 92029, operating as a collection agency, and is a "debt collector" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
	1
	2
	- 3
	ے 4
	4 5
	6
	7
	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	6
2	7
2	8

- 6. Does 1-10 (the "Collectors") are individual collectors employed by ARS and whose identities are currently unknown to the Plaintiff. One or more of the Collectors may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.
 - 7. ARS at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

A. The Debt

- 8. A financial obligation (the "Debt") was allegedly incurred to an original creditor (the "Creditor").
- 9. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meets the definition of a "debt" under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).
- 10. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to ARS for collection, or ARS was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.
- 11. The Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in "communications" as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

B. ARS Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

12. Within the last year, ARS contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect the Debt from "Alicia Clemens" (the "Debtor").

- 13. Plaintiff does not know the Debtor and is in no way responsible for the Debt.
- 14. During the initial conversation and during every conversation thereafter, Plaintiff informed ARS that she was not the Debtor, did not know the Debtor or her whereabouts and that Plaintiff was in no way associated with the Debt.
- 15. During each conversation, Plaintiff instructed ARS to cease all communications with her.
- 16. Thereafter, despite having been so informed on several separate occasions and instructed to cease communications, ARS continued calling Plaintiff at her residential telephone in an attempt to collect the Debt at annoying and harassing rate.
- 17. Plaintiff was ultimately forced to seek the assistance of counsel in an effort to get ARS to stop calling.

<u>COUNT I</u> <u>VIOLATIONS OF THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT</u> <u>15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.</u>

- 18. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 19. Defendants engaged in behavior the natural consequence of which was to harass, oppress, or abuse the Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692d.

- 20. The Defendants caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged the Plaintiff in telephone conversations, with the intent to annoy and harass, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5).
- 21. Defendants used an unfair and unconscionable means to collect the debt, in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1692f.
- 22. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.
- 23. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of the Defendants' violations.

<u>COUNT II</u> <u>VIOLATION OF THE ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION</u> <u>PRACTICES ACT, Cal. Civ. Code § 1788 et seq.</u>

- 24. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 25. The Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, California Civil Code section 1788 *et seq.* ("Rosenthal Act") prohibits unfair and deceptive acts and practices in the collection of consumer debts.
- 26. ARS National Services, Inc., in the regular course of business, engages in debt collection and is a "debt collector" as defined by Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.2(c).

- 27. The Defendants caused a telephone to ring repeatedly and engaged the Plaintiff in continuous conversations with an intent to annoy the Plaintiff, in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.11(d).
- 28. The Defendants communicated with the Plaintiff with such frequency as to be considered harassment, in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.11(e).
- 29. The Defendants failed to comply with the provisions of 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq., in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.13(e).
- 30. The Defendants did not comply with the provisions of Title 15, Section1692 of the United States Code, in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.17.
- 31. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of the Defendants' violations.

COUNT III INVASION OF PRIVACY BY INTRUSION UPON SECLUSION

- 32. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 33. The Restatement of Torts, Second, § 652B defines intrusion upon seclusion as, "One who intentionally intrudes...upon the solitude or seclusion of another, or his private affairs or concerns, is subject to liability to the other for invasion of privacy, if the intrusion would be highly offensive to a reasonable person."
- 34. California further recognizes the Plaintiff's right to be free from invasions of privacy, thus the Defendants violated California state law.

- 35. The Defendants intentionally intruded upon Plaintiff's right to privacy by continually harassing Plaintiff with the above referenced telephone calls.
- 36. The telephone calls made by the Defendants to Plaintiff were so persistent and repeated with such frequency as to be considered, "hounding the plaintiff," and, "a substantial burden to her existence," thus satisfying the Restatement of Torts, Second, § 652B requirement for an invasion of privacy.
- 37. The conduct of the Defendants in engaging in the illegal collection activities resulted in multiple invasions of privacy in such a way as would be considered highly offensive to a reasonable person.
- 38. As a result of the intrusions and invasions, the Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages in an amount to be determined at trial from the Defendants.
- 39. All acts of the Defendants and its agents were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, the Defendants are subject to punitive damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against the Defendants:

A. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against the Defendants;

1	B. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(2)(A	
2	against the Defendants;	
3 4	C. Costs of litigation and man	sonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C.
5		Defendants;
6	5	to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(a);
7		
8 9	E. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for knowingly and willfully committin	
9 10	violations pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 1788.30(b);	
11	F. Actual damages from the Defendants for the all damages including	
12	emotional distress suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/o	
13	negligent FDCPA violations and intentional, reckless, and/or negligent	
14	invasions of privacy in an amount to be determined at trial for the	
15 16	D1 1 100	
17		
18		
19	H. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.	
20	TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS	
21		
22	DATED. August 30, 2013	TAMMY HUSSIN
2324		By: /s/ Tammy Hussin
2 4 25		Tammy Hussin, Esq. Lemberg & Associates, LLC
26		Attorney for Plaintiff, Annette Haenel-Clemmons
27		Cicinilions
28	$\ \ $	